DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 478 RC 010 476

TITLE Migrant Institute (Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, June 26-28, 1974).
INSTITUTION Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit 16, Lewisburg, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Bucknell Univ., Lewisburg, Pa.; Public Committee for the Humanities, Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE 26 Jun 74
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Role; Agricultural Laborers; *Cultural Differences; Disadvantaged Environment; Disadvantaged Groups; Individual Power; *Institutes (Training Programs); Life Style; *Migrant Problems; *Migrant Welfare Services; Social Services; State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The 3-day Institute investigated the adequacy of social agencies and institutions which provide services and assistance to migrant families during their stay in Pennsylvania. Institute activities included presentations by three principal speakers, followed by panel discussions and "action workshops". The workshops provided an opportunity for participants to informally meet with the principal speakers and discuss their presentation and any aspect of the migrant situation in Pennsylvania and outside the state. The speakers addressed the migrant subculture; the differences between the migrant subculture and the local community; and the services to migrant families which are presently available from agencies and institutions in Pennsylvania, suggesting areas for improvement. After each day, participants completed an assessment of the day's activities. In addition, they completed a more general evaluation form on the last day. Participation in the Institute was indicated as a valuable experience for clarifying problems, improving understandings of the migrant situation in the State, and providing information about available services for migrants. The most frequently voiced criticism was that farmworkers themselves were not present. This report summarizes the Institute's program. Appended are the Institute's agenda; the edited texts of the three principal presentations; copies of announcements and invitations; lists of radio stations, newspapers, and individuals receiving information about the Institute; and copies of the evaluation forms. (NQ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152478

MIGRANT INSTITUTE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John E. Lutz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Sponsored by
Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit
32 University Avenue
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

and

The Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania
Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

John E. Lutz
Project Director

June 26-28, 1974
The Forum
Bucknell University

EC010476

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is gratefully given to the following individuals and institutions for their assistance with the planning and execution of the program reported herein.

Dr. Patrick F. Toole, Executive Director of the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit (CSIU), encouraged the development of the program and the use of CSIU resources to complement and supplement the original re-grant funds.

Charles MacKay, Executive Director of the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania and the Committee provided financial support through re-grant funds for the program's operation and encouraged the full development of the prograr

Bucknell University provided the residential, dining, and meeting facilities necessary for the conduct of the program.

Mary Ostrander, CSIU Planning Assistant maintained responsibility for the myriad of details and arrangements required for planning the program and its support activities and the original editing of program tapes and transcripts. Her assistance deserves encomiastic acknowledgment.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. 1

PROGRAM SUMMARY 3

EVALUATION. 9

APPENDICES

A. Agenda of Migrant Institute 13

B. Edited Presentations of Cletus Daniel, Cassandra Stockburger, and R. Wakefield Roberts. 15

C. Pre-Institute Publicity. 33

D. Institute Evaluation Forms 47

INTRODUCTION

There are several unique aspects of the life of migrant farmworkers, such as the constant movement from home to home and school to school, which have definite intellectual, emotional, and social consequences for the migrant child and his family, as well as our larger society. Practitioners and administrators who have dealt extensively with migrant farmworkers know only too well the quality of the migrant life, the consequences of this life, and what needs arise from it. In order to deal effectively with these unique aspects of the migrant way of life, social agencies and institutions as well as community resources must be marshalled in a two-way information dissemination program that can improve understanding of the migrant life and provide incentives for improving the physical, social, emotional and educational aspects of that life.

The Migrant Institute was proposed as a means to meet this need for information dissemination. Its anticipation was to provide an opportunity for representatives of those Commonwealth agencies and institutions which deal with the problems of migrant farmworkers, to meet, discuss, and debate information on programs and services which are being provided in Pennsylvania. The Institute was planned to improve participants' sensitivity to the migrant family's needs, provide opportunities to study the unique aspects of the migrant way of life, and encourage human interaction. Activities of the Institute were developed not only to provide information and improve individual understanding of the migrant situation, but also to clarify problems in providing services and administering programs, and develop potential solutions to these problems. *

*The agenda of the three-day Institute has been included in Appendix A.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The theme ("The People of Pennsylvania and Their Institutions: Who Does What?") reflected the frequently voiced concern that officials, agencies, and organizations need to develop more effective and more individualized ties to the people and communities they serve. The Migrant Institute was designed to investigate the adequacy of social agencies and institutions in providing services and assistance to mainstream migrant families during their relatively brief period of employment in Pennsylvania. The Insitute was concerned with an appreciation and understanding of the migrant, his culture, his way of life, his perceived needs and his future; and it dealt with how well project participants could relate to the migrant and what could and could not be done in providing services and assistance to him and his family.

The format of the Institute provided for a presentation by a principal speaker in the morning, followed by a panel discussion of the presentation. The afternoon sessions were to be "action workshops," an opportunity for participants in the Institute to meet with the principal speakers on an informal basis and discuss, not only the morning presentation, but also any aspect of the migrant situation in Pennsylvania and outside the state. Each day was given a theme, and the principal speakers were asked to address themselves to these themes in their presentations. The theme for Wednesday, June 26, was "An Overview of the Migrant Subculture." Thursday's theme was "Culture and Community" emphasizing the differences between the migrant subculture and the local community. The theme for Friday was "Who Does What in Pennsylvania?" emphasizing services to migrant farmworkers which are presently available from agencies and institutions in Pennsylvania, and suggesting areas for improvement.

The Institute format was chosen based upon the findings of a recent research effort on migrant education.* Those findings suggested that the effectiveness of such an institute would be increased through systematic selection and invitation of participants who had a high actual or potential capability for interaction with mainstream migrants, provisions for follow-up of institute activities and presentations, and application of ideas directly to migrant families and those who could and have worked directly with them. It was anticipated that common concerns for the human environment and current conditions of national life could help in the development of a coalition of concerned agencies to bear more effectively on the human needs of migrant families.

The afternoon action workshops had as their goals: (1) to provide an opportunity for information exchange and discussion; (2) to focus on practical problems faced by agencies and organizations in dealing with migrant families; and (3) to suggest various alternative solutions to

*Lutz, John E. A Critical Review of Migrant Education Programs. Lewisburg, Pa.: Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, 1974. 60pp.

p 2 blank

those problems. The anticipation was that discussion stimulated by the morning's presentations and led by those leaders would produce specific recommendations related to those presentations. Then as the recommendations could be implemented, they would have the potential for being part of solutions to problems faced by institutions as they attempt to relate to migrants as individuals.

Initial contacts were made with members of local Migrant Ministries, representatives of the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, Department of Health and Welfare, Department of Education, the Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers, university representatives from Pennsylvania and outside the state, and representatives of the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children. Three principal speakers were subsequently identified to lead the Institute. These were Ms. Cassandra Stockburger, Director of the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, Dr. Cletus Daniel, Assistant Professor in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University and a Fellow of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Mr. R. Wakefield Roberts, Director of the Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers. In addition to the principal speakers, six representatives of local and regional institutions and service agencies were asked to serve as panel members.

It was not the intention of this Institute to devise solutions to all of the social problems faced by migrants--but to address itself to how institutions such as the government and its agencies and human service organizations could better relate to migrants as individuals. It was the Institute's intent to suggest ways to work with institutions to develop and foster the values contained in the phrases "individual respect, personal security, and justice."

Wednesday, June 26: <u>An Overview of the Migrant Subculture</u> *

Dr. Cletus E. Daniel, an assistant professor in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University was the major presentor. Dr. Daniel had studied, lectured, and written extensively on the subject of labor unions and the California farmworkers' movement. His presentation focused on two main points: (1) that the conditions which characterize the lives of migrant farmworkers (poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy) are only symptons of a more pervasive condition, that is, powerlessness; and (2) that efforts to improve the conditions of migrant farmworkers have been and continue to be piecemeal attempts which have had very little effect. The change which is needed, according to Dr. Daniel, is for farmworkers to organize as other groups of laborers have done. He gave a brief synopsis of the history of organized labor in America and suggested that unless migrant farmworkers organize, they will remain powerless in terms of determining directions for their own lives. Those systems of services which are presently available are, of course, helpful, but they are ultimately only institutionalizing the problems.

*Edited texts of each presentation made at the Migrant Institute have been included in Appendix B.

Dr. Daniel's presentation was followed by a question and answer period. Most of the questions and the discussions which followed centered on the mechanics, problems and philosophy of organizing migrant farmworkers. Dr. Daniel conceded that the problems of moving from the present migratory system to a different system wherein migrant workers have some power are numerous and large, but not insurmountable. He was questioned about the mobility of the migrant, a significant problem for organization. Dr. Daniel felt that their mobility would not present a problem, since the farmworkers would carry the concept of organization with them wherever they went, and would not care to revert back to their disorganized status. Thus the concept of organization could be spread throughout the migrant stream.

When asked whether recent trends toward more enlightened social attitudes towards the disadvantaged and minorities in this country might help the situation of migrants, Dr. Daniel conceded that they might, but felt that there was no reason to wait 10 or 20 years to "let nature take her course". He felt that those people now involved in providing services to migrants ought to become politically active on behalf of migrants; the benefits to be derived would far outweigh the temporary disadvantages of reduced services.

Dr. Daniel cited the historical precedent of organizing as a work force. Although powerlessness is a characteristic of all poor and lower class groups, such diffused groups cannot be effectively organized; a common characteristic is necessary. Finally, the migrant worker himself must set his own goals. The best-intentioned service program and policies of business or government cannot invest the migrant with power. Obstacles to this goal can be removed through legislation, education or other means, but the migrant worker must define his own needs and work at achieving them, through organization.

A panel discussion followed the question and answer period. Panel members were Ms. Stockburger, Rev. Theodis Clarke, a member of the migrant ministry in Coatsville, Pa., and Rev. Rodney Henrie, a member of the migrant ministry in Mt. Carmel, Pa.

The comments of the panel members focused again on the problems in organizing migrant workers. Rev. Clarke discussed efforts in Chester County to make migrants more aware of services available to them. He commented that those who work with migrants can be overwhelmed by the number and kinds of problems they face. He emphasized the need for recognizing the importance of cultural differences of migrant workers.

Rev. Henrie expressed his agreement that the need for organization of migrant workers is indisputable, but felt frustration in trying to think of ways to implement organization. He discussed the problems of changing human attitudes, from the migrant's own attitudes, to those of the labor contractor, the farmer, the community and legislators.

Ms. Stockburger expressed her readiness for change after 20 years of work with migrants, and then discussed the question of mobility. Other mobile groups, such as the military, construction workers and race-track workers, are mobile, yet manage to provide for their own needs.

Two kinds of power were discussed: economic power and spiritual power. Both are important in terms of migrant powerlessness, but spiritual power--a sense of self-worth, a sense of community, a sense of purpose--is perhaps most important, and provides a basis for gaining economic power. Ms. Stockburger felt that the role of any agency or institution which deals with migrants should be concerned with developing a sense of personal worth in the migrant, even if it means that the migrant will eventually acquire enough "emotional power" to reject those agencies or institutions. Yet, according to Dr. Daniel, the migrant cannot rely on the government or institutions, since their vested interests are not the migrant himself, but their own preservation. There was some disagreement as to whether the migrant is actually powerless: is not his labor a valuable commodity and therefore a power in itself?

There was some debate on the concept of institutional change: is it possible to achieve institutional change, and should the migrant rely on it to bring about changes in his situation? One view was that present institutions can be changed, and that this will increase the migrant's power; the opposing view was that migrants organizing and achieving power will bring about institutional change.

Thursday, June 27: Culture and Community

The speaker for the second session of the Institute was Ms. Cassandra Stockburger. Ms. Stockburger had been the Director of the National Committee for the Education of Migrant Children since its inception, and throughout her professional career she has worked with and for migrant farmworkers in community action programs, as a teacher and as an administrator. The theme for this session of the institute ("Culture and Community") emphasized the contrasts between the migrant subculture and the culture of the local communities in which migrants worked. Ms. Stockburger's presentation focused on the characteristics of migrant farmworkers as a group, the characteristics of different segments of this group, and the psychological effects, especially on children, of the migratory life style.

Ms. Stockburger referred to the work of Dr. Robert Coles, of Harvard, who has worked extensively with migrant children and who has described these psychological effects in detail. The strain of frequently adjusting to new living situations, meeting people, often facing social rejection, never knowing with certainty that they will return to a place again, belonging nowhere--all of these contribute to an extremely negative self-image or even a total lack of identity. Such associated psychiatric problems as disorientation, confusion, depression, and often suicide were frequently present in the migrant subculture. Ms. Stockburger also mentioned the work of Dr. Enrique Galarza. His studies of the Mexican-American culture indicated the special characteristics which made it difficult for migrant farmworkers of this background to deal with the larger white culture.

The panel discussion which followed Ms. Stockburger's presentation included Dr. Daniel, Mrs. Mary Ellen Beaver, Chairman for the Eastern Area of the four-county Migrant Ministry Committee, and Mr. Tim Finnegan, from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources. Panel members

and participants discussed the problem of changing attitudes among growers and members of the community. Mrs. Beaver commented on some of her experiences in dealing with camp owners and growers as a representative of the Migrant Ministry, and felt that one problem, on both the local and national level, was the lack of leadership in the redress of problems in the migrant system. For example, few companies of growers which use migrant labor deal directly with the migrants themselves, but deal with the crew boss, who is often himself a source of injustice to the migrants.

Mr. Finnegan emphasized that the problems of migrant workers are in large part a problem of negative or misinformed attitudes among farmers and the community. In his inspections of camps, he commonly finds that farmers have no awareness of the problems of migrants, but look upon them as simple people, satisfied with their life. Adding to this problem is the fact that camp inspectors (and other representatives of state agencies) rarely have direct contact with migrants themselves.

The general discussion during the afternoon centered on some of the aspects of the psychology of the migratory lifestyle mentioned by Ms. Stockburger as well as some points mentioned by Dr. Daniel in his presentation: what are the barriers to organization or assimilation? Are the problems of migrants unique, or do they have something in common with other groups, and if so, how can we follow the lead of other groups in solving the problems of migrants? What is the most effective means of solving the problems of migrants: education, legislation, organization? How can stability be injected into the migrant lifestyle without abandoning their mobility?

The afternoon session concluded with a film, introduced by Ms. Stockburger, which depicted a Chicano family from Arizona in their travels from job to job. The film is part of a series entitled "Come Over to My House" developed by Xerox Corporation to introduce 4th graders to various lifestyles.

Friday, June 28: <u>"Who Does What?" in Pennsylvania</u>

The speaker for the final session of the Institute was Mr. R. Wakefield Roberts, Director of the Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers. Mr. Roberts studied at Union Theological Seminary and experienced 20 years working with migrant farmworkers both in and out of the pastorate. The theme for Friday ("Who Does What?" in Pennsylvania) reflected the concern of the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania for a clearer understanding of the issues which affect Pennsylvanians. In his presentation, Mr. Roberts declared that social matters and human problems cannot be dealt with in the same ways as the empirical sciences, and that policies aimed at solving problems should be determined on the basis of "what works", rather than on the basis of abstract theories of human behavior. Too often the process for achieving a desired end becomes more emphasized than the end itself. He then described the efforts of the Council which he described as a "multi-faceted systems design of outreach, referral and follow-up" designed to define and fill gaps in the services provided to migrant farmworkers.

Member of the panel discussion which followed Mr. Roberts' presentation included Dr. Daniel, Ms. Stockburger, Mr. Finnegan and Mr. Parker Coble from the Lincoln Intermediate Unit Migrant Program. Dr. Daniel began the panel discussion by commenting that Mr. Roberts' suggestion that agencies deal with "what works" might be effective in the short run but disastrous in the long run, and that committment alone cannot bring about effective

action. He was concerned that Mr. Roberts had not discussed any specific programs in which the Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers (PCF) was involved. Mr. Coble and Ms. Stockburger re-emphasized the interrated problems of a lack of coordination between programs and a lack of a national policy on migrants. The discussion which followed the panel's comments centered on the function of the PCF, whether agencies like the PCF can and should coordinate programs for migrants, the extent to which programs should be coordinated (whether locally, statewide or on a national basis), and the conflicts between policy-makers and "practitioners".

EVALUATION

As a result of the presentations during the Institute and the discussions which followed them, several issues were identified which contribute to problems for those who are involved in providing services to migrants. Ms. Stockburger's presentation dealt with some of the factors which make the problems of migrant farmworkers fairly unique. The two factors emphasized were: (1) the psychological effects of migrancy on adults and children (described by Dr. Daniel as "the psychology of powerlessness ") and (2) the cultural backgrounds of migrant farmworkers which serve as barriers between migrants and members of the dominant culture, and even between different groups of migrants.

Another point emphasized by Ms. Stockburger was the fact that there is no national policy regarding the disadvantaged status of migrant farmworkers. (The Migrant Record Transfer System, which has been one attempt to systematize services provided to migrant workers on their way "up the stream", was generally labeled a failure.) One result of this failure to develop a national policy relative to migrant farmworkers is, obviously, a duplication of efforts on the parts of existing service organizations. Another result is that efforts which are made are not as effective as they might be, since service agency personnel do not have a clear idea of what it is they are trying to accomplish: Is the goal to make migrancy more viable? To eliminate the system altogether? To provide short-term aid? The failure of service agencies to define answers to these questions on a nationwide basis severely limits the effectiveness of services, and contributes to another problem which was identified at the Institute, namely, the institutionalization of the problem.

Institutionalization was identified by Dr. Daniel in his presentation on Wednesday morning. Bureaucracies which are born to help alleviate the problems of migrant farmworkers sometimes serve only to reinforce, legitimize, and institutionalize the problems, thereby perpetuating problems to keep themselves "in business". This happens, according to Dr. Daniel, because the power to affect their lives is never in the hands of migrant farmworkers themselves, but remains with the bureaucracies who provide legal advice, medical help, school programs, and other services according to their own perceptions of the needs of migrant farmworkers. Thus, most of these service organizations, no matter how well intentioned, provide only the illusion of change rather than actual change. He suggested in his presentation that the whole approach to dealing with the migrant situation needs to be altered to provide for a major redistribution of power, and that this will not happen as long as bureaucracies are the mode chosen to deal with these problems.

Most participants in the Institute agreed with the major point raised by Dr. Daniel's presentation; that is, that migrant farmworkers must have a direct voice in dealing with their own problems, instead of remaining dependent upon agency personnel to administer services to them. Some participants, however, could not agree that organization was the ultimate answer to this problem, and few could arrive at any viable alternatives to present systems of providing services. This issue was frequently mentioned and discussed during the three days of Institute activities.

Participant Reactions

After each day of the Institute, participants were asked to complete an assessment of the activities completed on that day. In addition, they were asked to complete a more general evaluation form on the closing day of the Institute. Copies of each form have been included in Appendix D.

Generally, most participants had worked with migrant farmworkers in several capacities. Those most frequently mentioned were migrant instruction (tutoring and summer programs), migrant program and curriculum development, and program director and coordination. The average number of years of experience working with and for migrants amounted to four years, with a range from one to fourteen years indicated.

Participation in the Institute was indicated as a valuable experience for clarifying problems, improving understandings of the migrant situation in Pennsylvania, and providing information about available services for migrants. The most valuable aspects of the Institute were further identified as "hearing people finally talk openly about migrant problems," "a high level of mutual enthusiasm generated and directed toward a coordinated resolution of migrant problems," and "getting to talk personally to people involved in various migrant services." The least valuable aspects, on the other hand, were identified as "displays of defensiveness and 'possessiveness' by some program representatives," and "the breadth and lack of focus of suggested solutions to problems."

The participants were also asked to rate the degree of achievement of the goals established for the Institute. Each of the three goals (to provide an opportunity for information exchange and discussion, to focus on practical problems faced by agencies and organizations in dealing with migrant families, and to suggest various alternative solutions to the problems faced by agencies and organizations in developing more effective and individualized ties to the people and communities they serve) was achieved to some degree, according to replies on the evaluation forms.

Evaluations of daily activities indicated that Ms. Stockburger and Dr. Daniel both displayed a great deal of knowledge and expertise in their fields. The most practical presentation, according to evaluation replies, was that of Ms. Stockburger. Participants agreed that her presentation provided much information which could be directly useful in their work with migrant farmworkers. The most informative panel discussion was that of Dr. Daniel, Stockburger, Finnegan and Coble as they reacted to the presentation made by Mr. Roberts.

Problems and Suggestions for Improvement

Reference to the list of invited participants will reveal that efforts were made to include representation from any and every individual, organization, or institution which regularly has contact with migrant farmworkers, including educators (from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, as well as colleges and universities and those involved in migrant education) and growers throughout the state. In addition, through newspaper articles and radio announcements, invitations were extended to anyone who might not have received a letter. Perhaps further advertisement would have been

helpful--on the whole, however, the relatively small turnout of nearly 30 cannot be attributed to a failure to invite appropriate representation. One reason suggested by some of those invited for the small number of participants was that very few migrants were expected in most areas of the state during the 1974 season, so that programs and services aimed at migrant farmworkers were being cut back, or in some cases, cancelled. A second possible explanation of the small attendance was the timing of the Institute. It may have conflicted with the beginning of the influx of those farmworkers who did come into the state, so that growers, educational personnel, and personnel of service agencies may have been too involved in their programs to attend. One participant suggested that the Institute would have been more effective had it been scheduled for early spring.*

The most frequently voiced criticism of the Institute attendance was that farmworkers themselves were not present. Farmworkers were not invited for two main reasons. First, there was no effective way to locate and contact those workers who were in the area at the time, and it is doubtful that many would have attended the Institute had they been invited. Secondly, the Institute was designed to provide a forum for those who provide services to farmworkers to discuss their own problems in providing these services. Had any farmworkers attended, they might well have been intimidated by the situation and the surroundings, and would have, in any case, shifted the focus of the Institute from an investigation of the problems faced by program administrators and practitioners in providing services, to a reiteration of the well-known problems of migrant farmworkers.

Any future attempt to organize a program following the format of this Institute might profit from several suggestions for improvement. As mentioned previously, timing is an important factor; a program scheduled for early spring might provide more benefit to the participants and might allow for larger representation. One session of any future program could involve migrant farmworkers and provide a more realistic investigation of the adequacy of service agencies in meeting actual migrant farmworker needs. Finally, more specific expectations in terms of objectives should be defined rather than planning activities in relation to broad goal statements alone.

---

* Appendix C includes copies of announcements, articles, and invitations, and lists of radio stations, newspapers, and individuals receiving this information announcing the Institute.

APPENDIX A

CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA INTERMEDIATE UNIT
82 University Avenue
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837

MIGRANT INSTITUTE

Wednesday - June 26, 1974: An Overview of the Migrant Subculture

9:00 a.m. Coffee, registration.
9:30 a.m. Welcome, introduction, orientation to the Institute.
9:45 a.m. "The Disadvantaged Status of Farmworkers in America", Dr. Cletus Daniel, Assistant Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. The Forum.
10:45 a.m. Panel discussion: Ms. Cassandra Stockburger, Reverend Theodis Clarke, Migrant Ministry, Reverend Rodney Henrie, Migrant Ministry.

11:45 a.m. Lunch.

1:00 p.m. Action Workshops. Olin Science Building.
3:30 p.m. Summaries and reactions to Workshops.

5:30 p.m. Dinner.

Thursday - June 27, 1974: Culture and Community

9:00 a.m. Coffee, registration.
9:30 a.m. "Wednesday's Children", Ms. Cassandra Stockburger, Director, National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children. The Forum.
10:30 a.m. Panel discussion: Dr. Cletus Daniel, Mrs. Mary Ellen Beaver, Chairman for the Eastern Area of the Four-County Migrant Ministry Committee, Mrs. Marie Matalon, Pennsylvania Migrant Health Program.

11:45 a.m. Lunch.

1:00 p.m. Action Workshops. Olin Science Building.
3:30 p.m. Summaries and reactions to Workshops.

5:30 p.m. Dinner.

Friday - June 28, 1974: "Who Does What?" in Pennsylvania

9:00 a.m. Coffee, registration.
9:30 a.m. "The Migrant in Pennsylvania: Present Services and Future Plans", Mr. R. Wakefield Roberts, Director, Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers. The Forum.
10:30 a.m. Panel discussion: Dr. Daniel, Ms. Stockburger, Mr. Tim Finnegan, Division of Housing and Institutional Environments of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, Mr. Parker Coble, Lincoln Intermediate Unit Migrant Program.

11:45 a.m. Lunch.

1:00 p.m. Action Workshops. Olin Science Building.
2:30 p.m. Summaries and reactions to Workshops.
3:00 p.m. Institute summary and adjournment.

p. 12 blank

15

APPENDIX B

The Disadvantaged Status of Farmworkers in America*

Cletus Daniel
Assistant Professor
School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University

As a historian, I am interested in how people have done things in the past, and when I was invited to participate in this Institute, I thought that an investigation of how people had approached this problem in the past could provide information about the contemporary problems of migrant workers. One procedure could be to emphasize the lack of statistical data available pertaining to migrant workers and the conditions of workers in agriculture, and, in this way, to make the case that migrants are marginal people (as if that case had to be made through statistics.) In fact, in reading a paper at the 1972 convention of the Industrial Relations Research Association, a social scientist lamented that "the real migrant problem is identifying the migrant problems."

Of course, there is a solid basis to this complaint. We don't, for example, know how many farmworkers there are in America. We have never known. We don't know how many children work in agriculture. We have guesses and estimates (and they are intelligent estimates), but we don't have precise numbers. The American Friends Service Committee in 1970, based on a five-state survey, estimated that there were about 800,000 children working in agriculture. The Department of Labor didn't have its own guess, so they adopted that estimate as a reasonable one, and I think it is reasonable. We don't know how many of the few who qualify really get minimum wage and Social Security benefits. We don't know how many farmworkers are disabled or how many died from the indiscriminate use of pesticides every year.

It's true that we lack knowledge—that we have rather imprecise measurements of the conditions pertaining to employment in agriculture. Yet this kind of quantitative imprecision doesn't preclude our making qualitative judgements about the conditions. We have known the unhappy realities of the migrant labor system for generations despite our inadequate statistics. We have known that migrant farmworkers, whatever their number, were and are the most disadvantaged labor force in America. We have known that the consequences of child labor in agricultural are tragic whatever the number of children involved actually might be. We know that all farmworkers who qualify for minimum wage and Social Security benefits are not getting them, even though we don't know exactly how many are cheated. We know that the indiscriminate use of dangerous pesticides is harmful even though we don't have a precise annual body count. In short, what we do know and have known for a very, very long time, is that farmworkers and especially migrant farmworkers are among the most thoroughly exploited and powerless people in America.

To say that migrant workers are powerless is certainly to say the obvious. In a society as power conscious as this one, it is, upon reflection, probably apparent to most that what the "haves" have and the "have nots" don't have is power. You may, of course, substitute the synonym of your choice: influence,

---

* edited text of a presentation made at the Migrant Institute at the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit in Lewisburg, Pa., on June 26, 1974.

p. 14 blank

control, authority, clout. There are many substitutes for the word "power". They mean nearly the same thing; we understand them to mean the same thing.

This realization that power is the measure of all things is fundamental to all Americans and results in our making individual and collective measurements of our relative power status in society. Interesting, however, is the fact that in our consideration of the plight of farmworkers over the past several decades, we have avoided seeing the problem that these workers face in this context of power. Instead, we focus our attention almost exclusively on the symptoms of powerlessness, hoping to devise means by which we might keep the misery and degradation which attend the migrant labor system within acceptable limits.

It wasn't until 1969, almost a century after we had begun to notice that all is not well for those down on the farm, that the Congress of the United States permitted itself an examination of the status of migrants within this compellingly American context of power. After years of emphasis on measuring and describing the plight of farmworkers, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, finally grasping the essential nature of the struggle for farmworker organization going on in California at the time, took a significant new direction, determining in the words of its chief counsel, "to study powerlessness itself rather than explore and dramatize the conditions of poverty, exploitation, malnutrition, sickness, disease, poor housing, hunger, and illiteracy." The 1969 hearings, entitled "Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers' Powerlessness", were designed to

> explore the extent to which migrant and seasonal farmworkers are powerless to influence decisions that affect their lives in both their home-based community and the so-called "user" states, and to examine the degrees to which and the ways in which farmworkers are deprived of political power, deprived of economic power, deprived of cultural pride, deprived of rights and privileges which most Americans take for granted.

When the hearings concluded in 1970, more than a full year after they had begun, the Committee had amassed more than 6,000 pages, totaling 16 volumes of evidence documenting the extraordinary powerlessness of the farmworker in America. But the significance of those hearings did not derive from their findings, which were entirely predictable; anyone knowledgeable in the area of migrant problems knew those problems were there and knew they were tragic problems. Rather, the significance of the hearings derived from the fact that we were now viewing the status of farmworkers in America from the new perspective of power. By looking at farmworker powerlessness instead of simply exploring once again the abominable conditions of living and working that migrants are subjected to, the Committee finally began to emphasize the cause rather than the effects of the situation--the essential problem rather that its manifestations. Even more importantly, by acknowledging the fact that powerlessness is the underlying cause of farmworkers' miserable and degraded conditions, the Committee promoted the realization that any genuine solution to the problem must inevitably provide for redress of the imbalance of powers in rural America; in short, must provide for the fundamental redistribution of power within the agricultural local economy.

While this suggestion that a basic redistribution of power is indispensable for any permanent resolution to the migrant problems may seem drastic to many and even revolutionary to some, it follows inexerably from any careful inquiry into the extent and depth of migrant farmworker powerlessness. As a worker, the migrant is almost totally powerlessness to exercise influence on conditions of employment which rule his working life. Where he works, when he works, how he works, for whom he works, how long he works, under what conditions he works, and for how much pay he works, are all questions to which answers are usually arbitrarily supplied without the migrant worker being consulted. The migrant is more often than not completely at the mercy of labor contractors and farm employers whose economic interests are generally in direct conflict with his own.

Politically of course, the migrant is a nonentity because he or she is transient, uninformed, uneducated, alienated, isolated, and discriminated against by law and is also almost never a participant in the political process. While the franchise--the vote--may be the traditional means by which Americans exercise individual and collective influence on the instrumentality of government, for migrants it has been at best an irrelevancy and at worst an hypocrisy.

Legally, the migrants have been the subject of extraordinary discrimination and neglect. Because governments at every level are generally responsive to power above all else, they have not been responsive to the needs of farmworkers. Insofar as governments have acted it has almost always been in the interest of farm employers, and thus detrimental to farmworkers.

Even a cursory survey of the legal status of farmworkers suggests the pervasive pattern of unequal and unfair treatment to which they have been subjected. When the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935, the law that guarantees workers' rights to engage in collective bargaining through representatives of their own choosing, farmworkers were expressly excluded, and they remain excluded today. In 1935, when the Social Security Act was passed, farmworkers were denied benefits afforded to other workers. Even when the law was amended in 1956 to broaden its application to farmworkers, the eligibility qualifications were so restricted as to continue to deny benefits to most agricultural wage earners. Similarly, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in 1938, its benefits, including minimum wages and restrictions on the employment of children were denied to farmworkers, and although it's true that subsequent amendments to the law have afforded farmworkers partial yet substandard conditions, it is also no less true that these workers have been powerless to achieve treatment on a par with that enjoyed by their counterparts in industry.

At the state level, this tradition of discrimination against workers has been no less pronounced, although agriculture has for years been designated by the U.S. Department of Labor as the third most hazardous occupation, ranking behind construction and mining. Most states still exclude farmworkers from the benefits of the Workman's Compensation Law. That makes very little sense except in the context of power. Equally revealing of farmworkers' long standing powerlessness before the law is the fact that of the 50 states, only in Hawaii are there provisions for unemployment insurance protection for farmworkers, even though the extreme seasonality of employment in agriculture makes such protection more important for them than for any other occupationa

group. Again, that's a condition which can be understood only in the context of power. Of course, additional evidence of this kind can be cited. But I think it's clear that the powerlessness which characterizes the economic and political aspects of the migrant's life extends also to his legal status.

Not very surprisingly, this powerlessness has exerted an enormous influence on both the subculture and the psychology of migrant farmworkers. For the eastern migrant especially, the real and perceived helplessness of migrants to exercise control their own lives has played a powerful role in shaping a subculture which accepts unpredictability and disorder as social norms. In seeking to harmonize themselves with this irrational and dehumanizing environment (and the pressures for conforming are no less great than in our own middle class culture), the migrants become more marginal and alienated, and assimilation into the mainstream culture (should the opportunity arise) is made doubly difficult and much less likely. Being "damned if you do and damned if you don't" serves very well as a definition of powerlessness.

Avenues of escape into the American promised land of affluence and order are, realistically speaking, almost non-existent for migrants. Education, which has been for successive generations of disadvantaged Americans the principal agency of social mobility holds very little hope for migrants. When the psychology of powerlessness which affects children and adults alike, combines with the economic and other pressures constantly at work to restrict assessibility of a meaningful education, migrants generally experience little or no improvement in the quality of their lives through this traditional means.

This inquiry into powerlessness could, of course, go on and be pursued at greater depth. I have only touched on a few of the most prominent, obvious aspects of it. I think it's clear, however, what is involved in the pervasive pattern of neglect, exploitation, discrimination, and poverty which is labeled "the migrant's plight". If we are going to change this pattern, I think we're going to have to realize it's not going to be significantly altered or eliminated until this essential problem of powerlessness is addressed. None of the relatively meager programs of relief and reform that have been adopted by the government to date have really confronted the problem of migrant powerlessness. They still deal only with symptoms rather than causes.

It would be wrong to charge that because these programs fail to address the underlying causes of the migrant situation they have been entirely devoid of redeeming merit. Any program, however poorly conceived and administered, which results in even one hungry migrant being fed, or even one sick migrant being healed, or even one illiterate migrant child being taught to read, or even one migrant family being provided decent shelter cannot be all bad, of course. But on balance, I'm convinced that the impact of most governmental programs and policies, however well intentioned, has been largely negative insofar as they have nearly all had the effect of reinforcing, legitimizing, and institutionalizing an inherently evil, exploitative system.

Every special health, education, and welfare program devised to assist migrant workers and their families, whatever its virtues, is in fact also a

special subsidy which permits farm employers, labor contractors, and other elements whose interests are served by the maintenence of the migratory labor system to perpetuate their power and perpetuate the workers' powerlessness. Similarily, Federal regulations, minimum wage, child labor, and Social Security laws, insofar as they deny farmworkers' rights and protections equal to those enjoyed by workers in industry, legitimise and perpetuate an entirety of agricultural exceptionalism which is based on the outworn mythology that farmworkers are not really workers in the industrial sense and thus need not be afforded the rights and privileges enjoyed by other workers. Also, farm employers are not really employers and thus ought not to be obliged to accept those responsibilities and restraints which we impose upon their industrial counterparts. In regard to this nagging question of whether any kind of a piece-meal employment program constitutes a viable response to the deep problems imposed by the migrant system, a colleague of mine at Cornell, Dorothy Nelkin, wrote, "An intolerable situation, reinforced by adaptation to it, can only be penetrated by fundamental changes in the complex relationship that constitutes the system. To date, the history of migrant policy has been one of only piece-meal change".

There does appear to be a growing willingness on the part of government to acknowledge the fact that programs aimed at improving the migrant situation have largely failed. In 1962, for example, in a report to the Congress entitled "Impact of Federal Programs to Improve the Living Conditions of Migrant and Other Seasonal Farmworkers" the General Accounting Office, after surveying the activities of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the Office of Economic Opportunity, concluded that federal programs have fallen far short of their collective goals of improving the quality of the migrant's life. They fell far short of this goal after spending millions of dollars, and building a bureaucracy, and institutionalizing the problem.

As I noted at the beginning, the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, by shifting its emphasis to a study of the causes rather than the effects of the migrant system and of migrant powerlessness, has finally made an implied admission that the migrant system cannot be made socially viable by only moderating some of its most abusive aspects. Yet when our government has been more willing to acknowledge its failures, it has not been particularly innovative or forceful in suggesting alternatives to the current migrant labor situation. Such suggestions have been forthcoming, however, from quarters outside government. Interestingly, nearly all of these suggestions are based on the idea that the best way to solve the migrant situation in America is to eliminate the migrant.

These approaches, whose common goal is the decharacterization of the work force through the manipulation of supply and/or demand, would, if they worked as their champions insist, no doubt greatly modify the nature and structure of the migrant labor system, and perhaps (though I doubt it) eliminate the migratory agricultural worker altogether. Others suggest that by encouraging the current trend toward mechanization of farmwork, the need for migrants will be elimimated, and along with it, the whole migrant system. Of course, what disappears in the face of mechanization is the work, and not the people who do the work.

There are many questions which could be raised in regard to the mechanics of these plans, but my main disagreement with them is that they do not address the problem of migrant powerlessness. They do not afford the migrant an opportunity to exercise even a small measure of control over his or her own destiny. Finally, they tend to perpetuate the idea of agricultural exceptionalism by ignoring the fact that the problems of migrant farmworkers are not entirely unique, and that the problem of powerlessness is one that has been confronted and successfully remedied by other groups of workers in America.

If it makes sense to believe that many and perhaps most of the sources of farmworker powerlessness derive from our long-standing tendency to regard the migrant as a ward of the nation rather than as a worker, and to regard the man who hires him as an embattled yoeman farmer rather than as an employer (and I think it does make sense to believe this), then we may find some potential answers to the question, "How will migrant workers overcome their powerlessness?" if we examine the methods which other workers in America have used to overcome their one-time powerlessness.

In light of the conspicuous power and affluence of so-called "big labor" today, it may be difficult for some of you to believe that virtually the entire industrial work force was powerless less that 40 years ago. In 1935, only about 5 percent of the work force (those who were the most highly skilled and the most strategically placed in the economy) were exercising a degree of control over their own working lives. Leaders of these skilled workers, who were also the leaders of the American Federation of Labor, generally felt that industrial workers--(iron workers, steel workers, textile workers, rubber workers; those millions of men and women who worked in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in the great mass-production industries in America)--because of low skills, heterogeneity, varied ethnic and racial backgrounds, and a dozen other reasons, were not really capable of organization. Daniel Tobin, who was the head of the Teamsters in the 1930's, referred to industrial workers as "the rubbish at the AFL's door." Of course, the idea of organizing farmworkers was even more forcefully discouraged by the AFL. Paul Scharenburg, who was head of the AFL in California, told a New York Times reporter in 1935 that "only fanatics are willing to live in shacks and tents and get their heads broken in, in the interest of migratory labor."

Of course both industrial workers and farmworkers, despite the AFL skepticism, made vigorous efforts to organize during the 1930's. For the most part, industrial workers, under the banner of the Committee of Industrial Organizations, later the Congress of Industrial Organizations or the CIO, won their fight against powerlessness. Farmworkers lost theirs, partly because they were overwhelmed by the great power of farm employers, partly because they failed to devise the organizational methodology suitable for agriculture, partly because the goals of farmworkers were incompatible with the goals of the Congress which led the 1930's organizational movement, and partly because the rights and protections extended to industrial workers through the National Labor Relations Act were denied to farmworkers.

There were subsequent attempts to organize farmworkers. In the 1940's a vigorous effort was made to organize workers at the giant DiGorgio farm in California--it failed. In the 1950's there were still other efforts

to organize farmworkers; they too failed. Finally in the mid-1960's things changed. After repeated failures in the face of assertions by some of the most knowledgeable experts on farm labor that it couldn't be done, farmworkers in California and later in Florida, using techniques borrowed from the labor movement and the civil rights movement, successfully organized, won recognition from their employers, and began for the first time to exercise control over their own lives.

Whether or not migrants on the east coast and in Pennsylvania can organize is problematical. Certainly the challenges facing eastern migrants are greater than those faced by the more sedentary workers who have organized in California's San Juaquin or Salinas or Cochilla Valleys. Much, of course, will depend on whether or not those individuals or groups, such as the Migrant Ministery for example, which have been supportive of efforts to affect improvements in the quality of migrants' lives by reforming the migrant system, will also be supportive of rather more drastic efforts aimed at reducing or eliminating the powerlessness of migrants through the instrumentality of labor unionism. There are, of course, numerous other potential barriers to successful organization of migrants, but in the end, none may prove more formidable than the psychology of powerlessness which the migrants themselves must overcome.

As things currently stand, it's difficult to forecast what the immediate future holds for migrants. If they fail to organize, it seems most likely that the problem of powerlessness (which I don't believe can be solved with any alternative means) will continue to manifest itself in the most degrading, demoralizing, and dehumanizing conditions which have long characterized the migrant system. If migrants are able to organize, and are finally and at long last able to achieve a measure of control over their lives, they will have taken a long step toward realizing what I think is the transcendent American dream. Because in the end--when you strip all the verbage and puffery away from our most precious national ideals--being your own man, being your own woman, exercising at least some control over your own life is, I think, what it's all about.

Wednesday's Children *

Cassandra Stockburger
Director
National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children

I'm happy to welcome the new faces today but disappointed that you were not here yesterday to hear our discussions firsthand, because even though they were frustrating to some of us, I think they were very meaningful and relevant for this Institute. I would like to say in the beginning that ordinarily I feel that workshops and institutes such as this tend to concentrate on the problems that we as agency people face--the problems we have in the delivery of our services to migrant families. We spend time in recounting what each of us is doing and how we do it and, in the end, very little attention is given to the point of view of the migrant himself, or to an effort to understand what the migrant problems are, not only in responding to these services, but what his problems are in just living life as a migrant.

What really attracted me to this Institute was that I felt it was conceptualized as something different. As I understood it, it's to give each of us as practitioners a chance to stand back from our day-to-day responsibilities and our worry about getting the job done, and just for a couple of days to look at the migrant people from the perspective of what migrants face in trying to live in an economy and a society which does not relate to them, and to look at what happens to human beings who try to live in such difficult circumstances. Finally, it was our hope, I believe, that on Friday we would turn back to the institutions and agencies and measure our services and our programs and our institutions against what hopefully have been some new insights.

I do think you had a good start toward doing this yesterday. I realize that any discussion of the powerful versus the powerless is threatening to all of us because we are in relative positions of power. So this morning I want us to look at who the migrants are and at least what some of us believe is happening to the migrant people as people and as human beings, and what this can mean in terms of community services.

Now as I came to know some of you yesterday, I have the feeling that all of us are personally familar with migrant families. We've seen them around the town; we've worked with them. But I wonder if we've given very much thought to who the children really are and how they came to be migrants. Do you see migrancy as a voluntary act or even as a way of life to be enjoyed, or do you see migrancy as a result of the interweaving of many factors in the social and economic life of the nation?

Until a few years ago, I really had not given very much thought to who among our many people actually become migrants; working with them it had seemed obvious enough. But one day I was leading an inservice workshop at Adelphi College in New York City with a group of VISTA volunteers who had spent a number of months or up to a year working with migrant people.

* edited text of a presentation made at the Migrant Institute at the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit in Lewisburg, Pa., on June 27, 1974.

I asked the question, "Why do people become migrants?" and there was silence in the room. After a while, a professional worker in the front row said, "They are looking for something they have read about in a book, they heard about on the radio, or saw on TV." I don't think I have tell you who have worked with migrants that I really couldn't believe what I had heard. I threw away what plans I had, and we spent a great deal of time talking about who the migrant people are, and what the social and economic factors are which force people into the migrant stream. Some of them are personal and some of them are family reasons, of course.

Who becomes a migrant? With few exceptions it is the very poor, the unskilled, and the least literate of our population. Here in the east they are drawn, for the most part, from traditional Southern farmworkers. They are the descendants of the slaves on the plantations, and later in a free society, the sharecroppers and the tenants. As mechanization and combination of farms took over, they have been forced off the farm. Their numbers have been increased by both black and white farm owners. These were the small marginal farm owners in the South and in Appalachia who could no longer compete with the larger and mechanized farms.

In addition to these groups, we draw from those areas in the United States which do not provide employment for their resident population. Two major suppliers of migrant farm labor are south Texas and, of course, Puerto Rico. The Mexican/American or Chicano migrant is frequently forced to look for work outside of Texas, because the Mexican national is allowed to freely cross the border and work for much lower wages in Texas, displacing the American citizen of Mexican descent who lives there. I should add here that I think I heard a couple of times in our discussions yesterday references to Mexicans as if they were not citizens of the United States. I would like to inject here that most migrants of Mexican descent that you find in the migrant stream have been citizens for a long time. Many of them are descendants of the families who were residents in the area before Texas became a part of the United States. So they are very much American citizens. There are some who have newly immigrated; there are some who carry dual citizenship and who move back and forth across the border; but for the most part, we should think of Mexican migrants as American citizens and not as foreigners.

Puerto Ricans of course, come to the United States because of too few jobs at home, or at least they come with the hope of more work and better pay on the mainland. So we find on the migrant work force the southern Black, the rural or mountain Anglo, and the Spanish-speaking from the southwest and Puerto Rico. If we add to this a number of American and Canadian immigrants we are faced with numerous dialects, several languages, and the most extreme divergence of cultural backgrounds imaginable. Faced with such diversity, is it realistic for us to try to isolate or define a migrant subculture?

Research about the migrant farmworker in other than the employment or economic areas has not really been organized. It is at best limited, and frequently deals with only a small piece of the picture. Some studies deal with one ethnic or racial group, some a geographic area or a specific problem such as housing or nutrition. Nevertheless, I think there are some characteristics which are common to all migrant farmworkers.

Whether migrants have a true subculture is debatable, but we do know that migrant life is characterized by certain more or less definable patterns. Migrant workers respond to these patterns differently. It depends upon their inner personal resources and the values and attitudes which they have learned from whatever regional, ethnic, racial, or religious culture they have been subjected to. I'll try to pull together what seems to be certain characteristics of all migrant farmworkers regardless of location or ethnicity, and then I'll also call attention to certain other factors that seem to be based in the ethnic or racial roots of the family rather than on the migratory way of life. Both have equal significance in dealing with migrant farmworker families, as we attempt to involve them in the services available in our communities.

As a point of departure, we can safely conclude that the constant movement, the isolation from the mainstream, the rootlessness of the migratory life style causes physical, psychological, and mental damage. So great is this damage that Robert Coles, who is a research psychiatrist at Harvard and who more than anyone else in this country has lived with and studied in a systematic way the personal lives of migrant farmworkers has said, "Migrants present us with a special and awful problem even when compared to other underprivileged people in the world." Caught up in this life style are hundreds of thousands of young children whose lives may be permanently damaged and whose future is often determined by what happens before they are ten years old.

When we of the National Committee for the Education of Migrant Children were finishing our study of migrant education programs a few years ago, we wanted a title for the report which would accurately convey the "plight" of the migrant child. The literature for 30 years has referred to migrant children as the forgotten one, the children of the fields, the children of the road, the children without roots. But these hardly seemed sufficient to cover all of the difficulties of the migrant child. One day the old English rhyme which ascribes children born on a certain day with special characteristics came to mind, and the more we thought about it, the more appropriate it seemed to call migrant children "Wednesday's Children" because it seemed to us that they are indeed the children of woe.

For the most part what affects the adults in the family affects the child. Except for specific instances when I refer to the migrant farmworker, I mean his children as well. Let us look at some of the specific characteristics of the migratory life. All migrants at some time are faced with moving to a new place. For some it is moving temporarily away from a place they call home, and to which they expect to return. For others it is simply moving on, for there is no home. Moving for whatever reason requires adjustments and accommodati The migratory family suffers the constant strain of accommodation to new situation Environmental changes are difficult for even the most secure in our population. Moving, the making of new friends, learning new or different modes of community behavior are hard enough with a guaranteed job and a comfortable income which enables us to purchase safe and acceptable housing, which assures us of acceptance in community institutions such as schools, churches, banks, and recreational centers. But if one must be constantly testing acceptance as well as learning new rules, the strength required is even greater.

Perhaps we can get some sense of what this moving means by turning again to Dr. Coles. He tells of his work with a nine year old child, a very intelligent girl who sensed that the time was approaching for another move. One day she drew a yo-yo and remarked, "I love the yo-yo because it keeps going up and down, and this is what I do." The child repeatedly drew pictures of the sun and blacked it out with clouds. There was the inevitable yo-yo in bright red and frequently she placed windows on a large door which dominated, but was never attached to anything. There were always the clouds and a sandbox. One day she added a tall plant and explained that it was a stalk of corn, and commented, "We pick a lot of corn up north."

From his conversations with her, Dr. Coles was able to put together the child's feelings about moving, as follows: "I hate to go. I found some sand over there, and my brother, Bill...he and my brother, Ed, and me like to go and make things there. Soon we will be going, I know. I can tell when it's happening--first we move our things in the car, and then we go away, and I don't know if we'll ever come back here or not. Maybe, my mother says, all depending, you know. I try to remember everything so I won't leave anything behind. Everytime we go my daddy gets sore at me because at the last second I will be running out of the car and checking whether I have left any of the things here. I know I will have left something."

Later Dr. Coles observed the family when they were leaving. He commented, "Twice I watched her do that--I watched her go into the cabin and look around. I watched her look and stare and most of all touch, as if putting her hands on the walls and doors, she could absorb them, keep them, make them a part of her." Dr. Coles further commented that while the family was waiting patiently in the crowded car, she ran her fingers over a broken-down cabin with no water and no electricity that she was about to leave. It was clear to him that the windows and doors she had drawn were all the cabins she entered and left over and over again. It was the tall corn that was drawing them out of the cabin and disrupting their lives.

Dr. Coles went on to say that this was an unusually sensitive child who had good conceptual senses and was able to symbolize much more than the average child. It does give us a certain feeling that I think all of us have had about moving. In a sense, migrant farmworkers are a stateless people, in the sense that they really belong to no one. They fall under no one's specific protection, and are not really wanted by anyone. This lack of belonging causes the migrants to suffer from the lack of personal identification.

We have talked about self-image and personal identification for children; it is also a problem for adults as well. Many migrants have poor ideas about who they are and where they belong. Further psychological damage is done by the constant pull between being wanted for his labor and then being rejected as a person. Workers frequently feel that they are tolerated and even welcomed in a community when there is work to be done but feel the push to move on when the job is done. Few of us who saw the NBC White Paper a few years ago can forget that young Anglo boy who, with head bowed and feet stirring the dust, kept saying to the interviewer, "I'm a bum, that's what I am; that's what people think we are."

Self-image is further dominated by the inability to emerge from poverty. Such a realization that it is not within one's power to change one's lot leads to frustration, resignation, and escapism. Physical problems among migrants are many. Some can be directly traced to their life style, others can only be guessed as being the accumulation of physical neglect and repeated trauma. While we have been convinced for years that child labor is harmful to children, we have been unable to get medical documentation of the cumulative effects of long hours of work on undeveloped bodies frequently already suffering from nutrition deficiencies. These kinds of longitudinal studies just haven't been done.

The life expectancy of farmworkers has been placed at 48 years. This really should tell us something about the early years. In a recent study of preschool migrant children in Texas and Colorado, it was found that from one-third to one-half of the children, although consuming adequate protein, were seriously deficient in vitamins A and D. Consumption of milk, fruit, and vegetables were low. About 40 per cent showed some evidence of general under-nutrition. There was also a frequent incidence of low height attainment and a lack of muscular development, although there seemed to be adequate subcutaneous fat, which would indicate a high caloric intake. Another interesting fact which emerged from this study found that the mean serum protein levels were significantly higher when the fathers had additional work outside the farm labor, and they were significantly lower when the parents did not speak English. This led the people who carried out the study to assume that the health of the children was directly related to the ability of the father to earn an adequate income to feed his family.

Any one of us who has spent any time at all in the average migrant camp is aware of primitive living conditions, crowded housing, limited or inadequate sanitary facilities. These all carry with them certain health hazards. These, coupled with poor nutrition and the lack of medical and dental care, set the stage for all kinds of physical suffering. As if this was not enough, farmworkers are exposed to serious occupational hazards, since agriculture is among the three most dangerous industries. The irony of this situation is the migrant farmworker suffers all of this in order to work. No other group of poor people makes this effort or works so hard at jobs that are so difficult . Yet despite this, he is often kept apart, denied the rights and privileges of other citizens, unable to earn a decent yearly wage, and, in effect, lives a homeless and vagabond life always in poverty.

What then are the effects of this life on the workers and their children? Some are immediately obvious. Children and adults alike suffer from poor nutrition. The limited medical attention results in, as one mother described it, "all the sicknesses there ever was." The constant moving disrupts the child's education and results in his leaving school permanently by age 12 or 14. Most migrant children, as we found in 1970, did not go beyond the sixth grade. Only 22 per cent ever entered high school, and of these, only one per cent finished.

Perhaps less identifiable and obvious are the effects of migrancy on behavior patterns. Few of us have not had growers complain of vandalism

and irresponsible behavior. Health officials, social workers, and educators are frustrated by what seem to be irresponsible or undependable responses. Law enforcement personnel and the community alike complain about or fear the presence of large groups of migrants in the community. Yet little has been done to understand and cope with the personal problems migrants must face everyday--the unending poverty, the isolated living conditions, the lack of personal identification. All contribute to psychiatric problems, which Dr. Coles described as extreme confusion, disorientation, depression, and, at times, suicide. The lack of identity creates confusion about who they are, where they were born, and where they are going. Dr. Coles told a Senate subcommittee, "I do not believe that the human body and the human mind were made to sustain the stresses migrants must face--worse stresses, I must say, than I have seen anywhere in the world and utterly unrecognized by most of us."

For the migrant child this kind of life becomes a reality very early. Even preschool aged children learn they must be responsible for younger siblings. On one occasion, a mother took a five year old out of my day care center to take him to the field because he was now old enough to pick beans. Recently, Xerox filmed a migrant family in Arizona for a fourth grade series on American life styles. Even the five year old in that family was up at 2:00 a.m., traveled to the field, and had her own clippers to snip off the onion tops and roots.

I well remember a nine year old girl in a camp in northwest Arkansas that I talked to one afternoon while she was ironing. I knew she had been up since 5:00 a.m. and picked beans until 1:00, and we talked about how she felt, about how she was living, and what she had to do. She summed it up by saying "I hate to pick beans, but I gotta earn my living." I think that when this happens to children five, six, seven, eight, and nine, that permanent damage is being done.

But despite all the seriousness of early work and responsibility, it is somehow ironic that these children manage to play as other children do during the early years. And to many an untrained eye, there is very little difference between the migrant child and other children. But by age 12 or 13 adulthood has arrived for many of the children. There seems to be no real youth culture among migrant families. They know by the age of 13 that they are branded and stigmatized and that they will probably follow in their parents' footsteps.

The migrant labor system has, through its use of crew leaders, created a dependant population who have surrendered many of their decision making rights. In effect, we have a patron or a semi-slave system which is very destructive of human dignity. As I have been talking, I'm sure those of you who know migrant families have been saying, "But this doesn't apply to so-and-so. I know they aren't like this," and you may be right. As I said in the beginning, families and individuals react in different ways to the stresses of their life styles. But I would caution you and again remind you that most of us are untrained in observing and diagnosing many of the serious problems which I have mentioned. Likewise, there may be variation in the actions because of the dominant culture to which the family belongs.

Dr. Enrique Galarza, who is the major student on the West Coast of Mexican Americans, says, "We may speak of farmworkers in this country as a class, but we cannot speak of them as a homogeneous cultural group." He goes on to point out that there are even differences among those of Mexican descent, and he distinguishes between those who have lived all their lives in the United States and who have undergone cultural changes in order to survive in the Anglo culture, the "green card commuters" who are those who have mingled the American and Mexican lifestyles because they usually go back and forth across the border, and then the illegal, who slip across the border, who often come from the interior, and who are considered the outcast in the poorest of Mexico and have all of the folk-ways of rural Mexico. However, Dr. Galarza says that he feels that he has isolated certain Mexican cultural characteristics in the Mexican agriculture worker. I would like to describe these only as an example of the kinds of things that we ought to be aware of when we work with people of other ethnic and racial groups and not necessarily as applying to the people that you will be working with (although some, I am sure, will be Mexican migrant workers).

Dr. Galarza outlines these cultural characteristics as the Spanish language, intercessory religion, family cohesion, family labor, a patron system, a pretechnilogical view of production and work, a reluctance to act publicly or to act organizationally, education as nonutilitarian, and the ethnics of verguenza and palabra (and these I will try to explain to you). If you go into the barrios of south Texas, particularly in San Antonio and the lower Rio Grande Valley, and if you understand Spanish, you will find it still flowing as very freely and beautifully in the intimate setting as Spanish can flow. But if you know Spanish only in the work day world, you find half-English/half-Spanish expressions which have been adapted to deal with the work situation. Quite realistically, in Spanish there are no words to explain the Rural Manpower Service (I'm not sure you can explain it English either), so the Spanish of the farm laborer doesn't really provide him with the conceptual tools to be on equal terms with his Anglo counterparts.

Most Mexican farmworkers came from Roman Catholic background; that is to say, according to Dr. Galarza, the church governs the high moments of their lives--baptism, marriage, and death. Most of the rest of the time is left to a confrontation with the saints. He indicated that the farmworker places a great deal of confidence in his prayers and that his concern is that there is no evidence that the employer places equal confidence in the response; therefore, the employer is not listening when the workers pray for a raise or for the elimination of a brutal crew boss. The Mexican farmworker has for his own protection, according to Dr. Galarza, recreated the Mexican patron system with the hacienda as protector. This gives him someone to turn to for a job connection and on whom they can rely when there is no work. So the labor contractor or the crew leader of the agricultural association is now a substitute for what in the traditional Spanish culture was the patron or the farm owner.

To older Mexican farmworkers, education is still a discipline to teach manners and customs, not an instrument to prepare one to earn a living. To them, a man can be educated though illiterate.

The concept of verguenza is something I think you come to feel if you work with Spanish speaking people. It is a feeling of shame associated with saying anything or doing anything in public which is embarassing or which they may not feel confident to do. It prohibits them or inhibits them from speaking out in public or taking public action. Also, they rely very strongly on the pledged word, the palabra; that is, I give you my word and you give me yours, and there is an understanding between us as two people. Dr. Galarza says that this has been one of the things that has most inhibited the unionization of farmworkers among the Mexican Americans. Because they could not use mass communication, they simply had to deal with each farmworker on a face to face basis and convince them that their word was good.

The concept of work to the Mexican farm laborer is somewhat different than in a society that has been brought up in a Protestant work ethic. They see work as protection for survival, and some have described it by saying that Mexicans work in order to rest, that they see it only as enabling them to live, not work as an end in itself. They feel that the body is all that they have to work for them, and have very little concept of creating mechanisms which earn money for them--one simply does not hire others to make money for him or to create. Dr. Galarza once found a farmworker who could explain all the intricate workings of the cotton picking machine; he had a feeling that if this man had created it, he would never have put it in the field to displace the farmworker since it would have been contrary to his concept of the meaning of work.

Dr. Galarza summarized the penalties and the loss of social power which the Mexican farmworker, a product of another culture, must suffer to work in an economy dominated by the Anglo culture. He must stumble through a language which he doesn't understand. He prays to a saint while the farmer sends a telegram to his congressman in Washington. He sees the primary social unit as a family while the Anglo sees the corporation as the provider, the arbiter of styles, and the giver of values. Work produces the only property--not property that works for you. He has not yet mastered the art of organization for he emerges from a society of folk laws.

Dr. Galarza warned that these differences, though different, should not be held as either primitive or inferior. They do, however, pose additional problems for the farmworker who does not know how to effectively function in the communities into which his travels take him and, therefore, makes his lack of power that much more obvious. They likewise pose problems for the community which seeks to provide services.

We could conceivably take each of the migrant groups and point out special traits that work for their good or for their detriment from the point of view of the dominant society. But this one example will hopefully serve to point out the kinds of things we should be aware of in dealing with either farmworkers or persons from backgrounds different from our own. I do have a selective bibliography here which I hope will be helpful to those of you who are interested in pursuing a study of the cultural backgrounds of farmworkers.

Now let us review briefly the things which I have said. Migrant farmworker families suffer from constant movement and the need to frequently accommodate to new situations. They suffer from a lack of personal identity and are confused as to who they are and where they belong. They are confused by the contradiction of being wanted for their work but being rejected as persons. The children learn the meaning of their life styles at an early age. There is no real youth culture, and education is ended prematurely. The crew leader system has created a sense of dependence and a loss of dignity. The perpetual poverty is debilitating and results in escapism. Primitive living conditions, poor medical care, and occupational hazards are factors in poor physical health and a shortened life expectancy. Different ethnic, racial, and religious characteristics may be factors in determining responses to the environment and to services offered.

There is so much that is disruptive in the migrant life style that it seems impossible to do anything about the fate of people caught up in it. After 21 years, I see very little real change. Wages are a little higher, work a little scarcer. Fewer workers go up the stream each year, but those who do, more often than not, face the same conditions as 20 years ago. There have been some changes to be sure--more people are concerned about causes as well as cures.

Twenty years ago, there were virtually no funds available to the community to provide essential services. Now there are millions of dollars in federal aid for education, health, day care, job training, and housing. But even this is not enough to change the system. Migrant farmworkers will never be liberated by federal dollars alone. I have long said that no other industry hires such a disorganized and unpredictable labor force as that used in agriculture. Surely the only real solution to the problems of migrancy is to end migrancy as we know it today as a dependent and disorganized work force. A much more stable work force which can be guaranteed an annual living wage is obviously preferable.

As we discussed yesterday, there are diverse opinions about what can or will be achieved, but one thing we know: farmworkers must have a voice in whatever process or processes emerge. In the meantime, we are still living with the old system, and I'm afraid we will be working with at least pieces of it in the future. There are some inherent things we can't do very much about, but some things we surely can. I am concerned that those of you who conceive and develop services as well as those of you who provide the direct services in clinics, schools, day care centers, or in special services in the camps--that you come to terms with the life style and the background of the child and his family so that you are able to reinforce him as a human being and as a person of worth.

The Migrant in Pennsylvania: Present Services and Future Plans*

R. Wakefield Roberts
Director
Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers

When we consider the great social policies of government, one assumes that they originate from the obvious grievances of real people, the moral outrage expressed by civil rights groups, the pathos of hungry people, the unhoused seeking shelter, and the unemployed seeking work. But one often finds that these policies do not come from the needs and desires of real people. Increasingly, these natural influences on government action are augmented, elaborated, and even preempted by another force that interacts with public thinking. It's an artifical world of numbers and abstractions, of averages and medians, of standard deviations and regression analyses. We might consider this to be the world of social scientists, the ones who swell and formulate our ideas on social policy.

I think a very graphic example of what I'm attempting to convey can be drawn from Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a social scientist who wrote,

> Social science is at its weakest, at its worst, when it offers theories of individual or collective behavior which raise the possibility, by controlling certain input, of bringing about mass behavioral change. No such knowledge exists. Evidence to such effects is fragmented, contradictory, incomplete. Enough snake oil has been sold in this republic to warrant the expectation that public officials will now begin reading the labels of the social science packages that they are offered.

Ernest Becker, also a social scientist, wrote in The Structure of Evil, an essay on the unification of the sciences of man:

> Measured against the needs of time, there is nothing remotely resembling a science of man. There are only mountains of disciplinary journals and hordes of busy specialists. What is their relationship to the momentous problems of survival and human dignity in our times? To ask the question is already to answer it. Taken separately, most disciplinary activity in the social science represents trivial work. True, it is hardworking, certainly well intentioned, at times deeply hopeful and anxious, but still somehow very much beside the point of the problems of man in comtemporary society.

---

*edited text of a presentation made at the Migrant Institute at the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit in Lewisburg, Pa., on June 28, 1974.

I think this can be interpreted that we cannot deal with social matters as we deal with the empirical sciences. Simply because we cannot make a final determination in a controlled atmosphere, we cannot fathom in advance the behavior of any person in any one particular situation. We cannot collectively assess all of the circumstances in a time interval that are going to react with him and that he in turn is going to react upon. We should look back at the first notion presented by Moynihan that we must somehow learn to deal with the things that work. I think that we have spent entirely too much time in procedural methods. Sometimes it is not a matter of looking for the outcome, but that greater attention is given to the "how to do" and how it should be done; sometimes the process becomes the thing that is being perpetuated rather that the desired end that ought to be determined.

The Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers (PCF) has first attempted to define the situation or problem or opportunity. For the PCF the problem has been defined as follows: The problems of farmworkers in rural Pennsylvania result from many deficiencies in the acceptability of social channels for many farmworkers to become self-dependent citizens and integrated human beings. The existing institutional practices tend to push the poverty-level farmworker out of the community mainstream and into socially undesireable roles, and block alternative routes to roles which are socially acceptable and desireable. Alternative routes may be developed by effecting institutional change in education, justice, health, employment, and social rehabilitation services throughout the state. Until institutions in the rural communities help the community become a good place to live, they will have difficulty in keeping their farmworker population. That might seem to be a rather different way of assessing the problem of migrants. The problems and difficulties of migrant agricultural workers ought to be the concerns of our entire institutionalized society.

A difficulty that affects the effectiveness of programs is the built-in notion of self-perpetuation--the notion that we must retain the problem or go out of existance. Another difficulty is that we make policy determination on the basis of political viability. The Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers' program has been designed to provide services for out-reach, referral, and follow-up that will promote economic independence and a better quality of life among the farmworker population served as it attempts to overcome these difficulties. Our aim is to identify gaps in provided services and then to provide those additional needed services.

Duplication of service is an important concern: Are we doing something that is already being done? The answer to that can be given by an example. We discovered an inability to track migrant children in the school systems throughout the State and throughout the country. That then became an identified gap in the educational services provided by the Department of Education. The PCF therefore contracted to track the children who are enrolled in migrant education program across the state. This service provides a means of locating migrant children and migrant families who are eligible for education programs. The PCF attempts to identify and fill gaps in needed services without duplicating the efforts of others.

CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA INTERMEDIATE UNIT

P. O. BOX 213 — LEWISBURG, PENNA. 17837

717-524-4431

PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT

Contact:

Mary Ostrander
524-4431

For Release:

Immediately

Migrant Institute
June 26-28, 1974

A three-day Migrant Institute, devoted to investigating the adequacy of Pennsylvania agencies and institutions which provide services and assistance to migrant families, is being planned and conducted by the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit. The Institute will be held in Lewisburg, Pa. on June 26-28, 1974.

Institute activities, including multi-media presentations, panel discussions and action workshops, will be concerned with an appreciation and understanding of the migrant, his culture, his way of life, his needs and his future. The emphasis of all activities will be on the practical problems faced by local and state agencies and institutions in providing services to migrant workers and their families. Participants have been invited from local, regional and statewide service agencies and educational institutions. Any individual or group interested in attending or sending a representative to the Institute is invited to write to Miss Mary Ostrander at the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, 82 University Ave., Lewisburg, Pa., or to call collect at (717) 524-4431.

Area Radio Stations:

WPGM - Danville
Larry Seader
First National Bank Building
Mill Street
Danville
275-1570

WUDO - Lewisburg
R.D. #1
Lewisburg
523-1222

WYZZ - Wilkes Barre
Bob Himalfarb
Wilkes Barre

WMLP - Milton
YMCA Building
Milton
742-8705

WBPZ - Lock Haven
132 1/2 E. Main St.
Lock Haven

WKOK - Sunbury
1150 Front Street
Sunbury
286-5838

WSEW - Selinsgrove
Bill Mahoney
R.D. #1
Selinsgrove
374-1155

WCNR - Bloomsburg
125 W. Main Street
Bloomsburg
784-1200

WHLM - Bloomsburg
107 W. Main Street
Bloomsburg
784-5500

WWPA - Williamsport
Woodrow Ott
330 Gov't Place
Williamsport

WLYC - Williamsport
331 Pine Street
Williamsport

WRAK - Williamsport
1559 W. 4th Street
Williamsport

CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA INTERMEDIATE UNIT

P. O. BOX 213 — LEWISBURG, PENNA. 17837

717-524-4431

NEWS RELEASE

Contact:

Mary Ostrander
524-4431

For Release:

Immediately

Migrant Institute
June 26-28, 1974

A three-day Migrant Institute, devoted to investigating the adequacy of Pennsylvania agencies and institutions which provide services and assistance to migrant families, is being planned and conducted by the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit. The Institute, which has been funded by the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania, will be held in Lewisburg, Pa., on June 26-28, 19

Institute activities, including multi-media presentations, panel discussions and action workshops, will be concerned with an appreciation and understanding of the migrant, his culture, his way of life, his needs and his future. The emphasis of all activities will be on the practical problems faced by local and state agencies and institutions in providing services to migrant workers and their families.

Speakers and discussion leaders will include Ms. Cassandra Stockburger, Director of the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children; Dr. Cletus E. Daniel, Assistant Professor in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University; and Dr. Gordon Mathers, Professor in the Department of Human Development at Penn State University.

Invited participants include migrant camp owners throughout the state, migrant program directors from Intermediate Units and colleges throughout the state, representatives of county agricultural extension services, child welfare services, local Migrant Ministries, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and area service

organizations. Any individual or group interested in attending or sending a representative to the Institute is invited to write to Ms. Mary Ostrander, Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, 82 University Avenue, Lewisburg, Pa., 17837, or to call collect at (717) 524-4431.

AREA NEWSPAPERS

BERWICK ENTERPRISE
106 East Front Street
Berwick, Pa. 18603
Edgar Fenstermacher, Editor

BLOOMSBURG MORNING PRESS
111 West Main Building
Bloomsburg, Pa. 17815

DANVILLE NEWS
15 East Mahoning Street
Danville, Pa. 17821
Joe McGlinn, Editor

THE MILTON STANDARD
21 Arch Street
Milton, Pa. 17847
Charles Johnson, Editor

THE NEWS ITEM
701 North Rock Street
Shamokin, Pa. 17872
William F. Dyer, Editor

THE DAILY ITEM
Second and Market Streets
Sunbury, Pa. 17801
John Huckabee, Editor

SELINSGROVE TIMES-TRIBUNE
103 South Market Street
Selinsgrove, Pa. 17870
Barbara M. Mitchell, Editor

UNION COUNTY JOURNAL
337 Market Street
Lewisburg, Pa. 17837
Jane Lou Buck, Editor

THE MIDDLEBURG POST
32 West Market Street
Middleburg, Pa. 17842

THE MIFFLINBURG TELEGRAPH
358 Walnut Street
Mifflinburg, Pa. 17844

OTHER STATE NEWSPAPERS

ALLENTOWN CALL
101 N. 6th Street
Allentown, Pa. 18105
Edward D. Miller, Editor

LANCASTER NEWS
8 West King Street
Lancaster, Pa. 17603
Harold J. Eager, Editor

ALLENTOWN CALL-CHRONICLE
101 North 6th Street
Allentown, Pa. 18105
Edward D. Miller, Editor

LANCASTER NEW ERA
8 West King Street
Lancaster, Pa. 17603
Daniel L. Cherry, Editor

ALTOONA MIRROR
1000 Green Avenue
Altoona, Pa. 16601
Robert W. Boyer, Editor

NEWCASTLE NEWS
27-35 N. Mercer Street
New Castle, Pa. 16101
Richard E. Rentz, Editor

BRADFORD ERA
43 Main Street
Bradford, Pa. 16701
Joseph M. Cleary, Editor

PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN
30th and Market Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19101
Bulletin Company, Publisher

ERIE TIMES
205 W. 12th Street
Erie, Pa. 16501
Joseph Meagher, Editor

PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER
400 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19130
Creed Black, Editor

ERIE TIMES-NEWS
205 W. 12th Street
Erie, Pa. 16501
William G. Rogasky, Editor

HARRISBURG NEWS
812 Market Street
Harrisburg, Pa. 17105
James R. Doran, Editor

HARRISBURG PATRIOT-NEWS
812 Market Street
Harrisburg, Pa. 17105
James R. Doran, Editor

JOHNSONTOWN TRIBUNE-DEMOCRAT
Locust Street
Johnsontown, Pa. 15907
W. W. Krebs, Editor

CENTRE TIMES
S. Frazier Street
State College, Pa. 16801
Jerome Weinstein, Editor

TIMES-LEADER NEWS
15 N. Main Street
Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18711
James F. Lee, Editor

YORK DISPATCH
17 E. Philadelphia Street
York, Pa. 17405
Charles F. Moore, Editor

PHILADELPHIA NEWS
400 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19130
Rolfe Neill, Editor

PITTSBURGH PRESS
Box 566
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230
John Troan, Editor

READING EAGLE
345 Penn Street
Reading, Pa. 19601
W. S. Dillon, Editor

SCRANTON TRIBUNE
338 N. Washington Avenue
Scranton, Pa. 18503
Robert J. Arthur, Editor

WILKES-BARRE INDEPENDENT
22 S. Washington Street
Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18701
T. F. Hefferman, Editor

SUN-GAZETTE
252 W. Fourth Street
Williamsport, Pa. 17701
Clifford A. Thomas, Editor

CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA INTERMEDIATE UNIT

P. O. BOX 213 — LEWISBURG, PENNA. 17837

717-524-4431

Dear

May I extend to you, on behalf of the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, a cordial invitation to attend and participate in what we hope will be an exciting and stimulating conference.

The CSIU is planning and conducting a Migrant Institute to investigate the adequacy of Pennsylvania agencies and institutions in providing services and assistance to migrant families. The Institute has been funded by the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania and will be held on the campus of Bucknell University in Lewisburg, Pa. on June 26-28.

Institute activities will be concerned with an appreciation and understanding of the migrant, his culture, his way of life, his needs and his future, and will concentrate on improving participants' sensitivity to the migrant, by providing information and an opportunity to discuss and debate issues related to the migrant situation in Pennsylvania. The emphasis of all activities will be on the practical problems faced by local and state agencies and institutions in providing services to migrant farm workers and families. It is the intent of the institute to provide an opportunity for a two-way information dissemination process between social agencies and institutions and existing community resources, with the aim of improving the physical, social, emotional and educational aspects of the migrant culture.

In general, each day will include two sessions, morning and afternoon. The morning session will begin with a multi-media presentation, to be followed by panel discussion and audience participation. The afternoon will include action workshops with the morning speakers. We have invited, as speakers and discussion leaders, three humanists whose experience with migrant workers and study of the migrant subculture will be an important contribution to the Institute:

Ms. Cassandra Stockburger, Director of the National Committe on the Education of Migrant Children; Dr. Cletus E. Daniel, Assistant Professor in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University; and Dr. Gordon Mathers, Professor in the Department of Human Development at the Pennsylvania State University. In addition to these speakers and discussion leaders, we have invited representatives of local community organizations as well as statewide service agencies to participate and to contribute to the Institute activities.

A nominal registration fee for the Institute must be charged; however, overnight accomodations and meals will be provided by the Institute and the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit. Please note that you may attend any single day program, but for continuity and follow-through we encourage your attendance on all three days.

We hope that the proposed activities of the Institute interest you, and that you and any other interested persons from your organization will be able to attend.

Enclosed are two tentative schedules of activities for the Institute and two registration forms - one for you and one to pass on to a colleague you'd like to invite. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call me collect at (717) 524-4431.

Sincerely,

Mary F. Ostrander

Mary F. Ostrander
Planning Specialist

MFO/jlp

Enc.

CENTRAL SUSQUEHANNA INTERMEDIATE UNIT
82 University Avenue
Lewisburg, Pa. 17837

MIGRANT INSTITUTE
June 26-28, 1974

REGISTRATION FORM

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

FIRM OR _____
ORGANIZATION _____

DAYS ATTENDING
(Please Check)

Wednesday, June 26 _____
Thursday, June 27 _____
Friday, June 28 _____

I will need overnight accomodations for
(Please Check):

Tuesday Night, June 25th _____
Wednesday Night, June 26th _____
Thursday Night, June 27th _____
Friday Night, June 28th _____

Please enclose a check for Registration Fees payable to the CSIU for $5.00 (for one day), $10.00 (for two days) or $15.00 (for three days).

Recommendation(s) Of Other Person(s) Who Might Be Interested In Attending The Migrant Institute:

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

FIRM OR _____
ORGANIZATION _____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

FIRM OR _____
ORGANIZATION _____

Send this form to:
Ms. Mary F. Ostrander
Planning Specialist
Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit
82 University Avenue
Lewisburg, Pa. 17837

No Later Than June 14, 1974

INVITED PARTICIPANTS

State Service Organizations

Faith Apple, Director
Snyder County Child Welfare Services

Mrs. Jean F. Cautilli, Acting Director
Union County Child Welfare Services

Rebecca Ellis, Director
Union County Child Development, Inc.

Mr. Timothy Finnegan
Division of Housing & Institutional Environ.
Department of Environmental Resources

Miss Lynn Groff
Field Services Counselor
Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers

Lilian Grover, Director
Columbia County Child Welfare Services

Hilda Klock, Director
Retarded Children's Program
Northumberland County Child Devel. Center

Arden W. Leigh, Executive Director
Northumberland County Child Welfare Services

Richard F. Little, County Agent
Agricultural Extension Service
Montour County

Mrs. Catherine Madigan
Human Resources Advisor
Pennsylvania Department of Community Affa

Mrs. Marie Matalon
Migrant Health Program

Mr. R. Wakefield Roberts, Director
Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers

Lieutenant Salvador L. Rodriquez
Community Relations Division
Headquarters, Pennsylvania State Police

Mrs. Bertie Shenk
ACSW, Department of Welfare
Commissioner of Family & Social Services

Miss Valerie Weiner
Coordinator of Field Operations
Pennsylvania Council of Farmworkers

Eleanor K. Yarrison, Home Economist
Family Living & Health Education
Agricultural Extension Service
Union County

Leonard G. Yearick, County Agent
Agricultural Extension Service
Northumberland County

Miss Leslie F. Young, Administrator
Montour County Child Welfare Services

Regional Service Organizations

Walter G. Barchet, Secretary
Lions Club, Lewisburg

Chad Combs, Executive Director
Susquehanna Valley Regional Medical Prog.

Robert Elion
Central Susquehanna Valley Legal Services

George Fasic, Director
Union-Snyder Regional Planning Commission
Bucknell University

Edgar L. Gardner, President
Watsontown Area Lions Club

Scott Hock
Youth Services Bureau, Bloomsburg

Christine Kuruna, Director
Sunbury Day Care Center

Mr. William Lepage, Deputy Director
Central Pennsylvania Health Council

Regional Service Organizations (Continued)

John C. Lyons, Executive Director
Central Susquehanna Valley Legal Services

Peter Mackey
Central Susquehanna Valley Legal Services

James Murphy, Administrator
John H. Vastine Foundation

James Raun, Executive Director
Tressler Lutheran Service Associates

John H. Shaw, Secretary
Milton Area Lions Club

Mrs. Ethel Wenner, R.N., Sunbury
Served migrant farmworkers for 9 years.

Education Program Personnel

John Brady
Centennial School District

Parker Coble
Lincoln Intermediate Unit #12

William Dallam, Chief
Division of Compensatory Programs
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Jean DiSabatino
Millersville State College

Joseph Dunn, Basic Education Associate
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Mrs. Joan Fletcher
Migrant Day Care Center, Susquehanna U.

Harry Gore
West Chester School District

Merle Hannum
Chester County Intermediate Unit

John Hyams, Senior Program Officer
Division of Compensatory Programs
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Dr. Charles Igoe, Director
Susquehanna U. Migrant Day Care

George B. Inskip
Lincoln Intermediate Unit #12

Dr. J. Charles Jones
Education Department
Bucknell University

Erwin Klinger
Upper Dauphin School District

Dr. Robert J. Labriola
Educational Development Center
Millersville State College

Dr. J. William Moore, Chairman
Education Department
Bucknell University

Robert T. Morris, Director
Franklin County Migrant Program

Dr. Anthony Pinne
Department of Education
Cheney State College

V. J. Selvaggio
Chester County Intermediate Unit

Charles E. Songster
Cheney State College

Gary Steier
Abington Heights School District

Richard Steiner
Moravian College

Eileen Sylvester, Director
Migrant Pre-School Program, CSIU

Joe Turse
West Chester School District

Intermediate Units

Dr. William G. Bartholomew, Exec. Direc.
Carbon-Lehigh I.U. #21

Harry J. Brownfield, Executive Director
Intermediate Unit #1

C. Howard Chesnut, Executive Director
Clarion Manor I.U. #6

D. Bruce Conner, Executive Director
Capital Area I.U. #15

Dr. Matthew W. Costanzo, Exec. Direc.
Philadelphia I.U. #26

Clyde E. Dalton, Executive Director
Delaware County I.U. #25

Carl S. Driscoll, Executive Director
Blast I.U. #17

Charles E. Glendening, Executive Director
ARIN I.U. #28

Dennis Harken, Executive Director
Montogomery County I.U. #23

Dr. H. Ronald Huber, Executive Director
Colonial Northampton I.U. #20

George Kensinger, Executive Director
Appalachia I.U. #8

Dr. P. M. Mensky, Executive Director
Northeastern Educational I.U. #19

John P. Milanovich, Executive Director
Beaver Valley I.U. #27

Dr. Jerry C. Olson, Acting Exec. Direc.
Pittsburgh-Mt. Olivier I.U. #2

Gerald R. Orr, Executive Director
Westmoreland I.U. #7

Dr. Harold E. Oyer, Executive Director
Allegheny I.U. #3

Phillip R. Phelps, Executive Director
Midwestern I.U. #4

Dr. George E. Raab, Executive Director
Bucks County I.U. #22

Frank A. Rackish, Executive Director
Seneca Highlands I.U. #9

Edward B. Reighard, Executive Director
Central I.U. #10

Nello A. Riccetti, Executive Director
Luzerne I.U. #18

Dr. Daniel A. Rohrbach, Executive Directo
Berks County I.U. #14

Dr. Lloyd Ruoss, Executive Director
Lancaster-Lebanon I.U. #13

William H. Snyder, Executive Director
Schuykill I.U. #29

Roy D. Wilson, Executive Director
Tuscarora I.U. #11

Dr. Alan Wolf
Northwest Tri-County I.U. #5

Growers and Camp Owners

Keith Eckles, Clarks Summit

Fairview Evergreen Nurseries, Erie

Chester Heim
Pennsylvania Farmer's Association

Van Houten
Camp Owner, Zion Grove

Charles Kingston
Personnel Manager, Musselman Foods
Biglerville, Pa.

Noah Kreider, Manheim

Paul Moyer
Camp Owner, Zion Grove

Thomas Oyler, Gettysburg

Growers and Camp Owners (Continued)

James A. Sandt, General Manager
Trexler Orchards, Orefield

H. L. Showalter
Hess Orchards Division, Waynesboro

Warren Thompson
Clarks Summit

Richard Trostle
Mount View Fruit Farms, Inc.
Biglerville, Pa.

Migrant Ministry

Mrs. George Beaver
Catawissa

Mrs. Ann Budd
Sunbury, Pa.

Rev. Theodis Clarke
Coatsville

Rev. Peter Crynes
Scranton

Rev. Charles C. Frazier
Pa. Council of Churches, Harrisburg

Rev. Mercurio A. Fregapane
Mary, Gate of Heaven Rectory, Myerstown

Rev. Charles Glandorf
Lewisburg

Rev. Vitold Gobins
Sunbury, Pa.

Rev. Rodney A. Henrie
Mt. Carmel

Rev. John L. Herbster
Watsontown

Rev. Raymond C. Hittinger
Hegins, Pa.

Rev. James Johnson
Lewisburg

Rev. Ernest Jones, Chaplain
Migrant Ministry

Mr. & Mrs. George Lendh
Selinsgrove, Pa.

Rev. Robert Logan
Simeon Lutheran Church, Gratz

John McHale
Clarks Summitt

Rev. D. Gene Patterson
Watsontown

Mrs. Charleen Ryan
Wilkes Barre

Miss Nancy Ryan
St. Michael's School

APPENDIX D

MIGRANT INSTITUTE EVALUATION

1. How have you been involved with migrant farmworkers in Pennsylvania?

2. How many years have you been working with and for migrants? _____.

3. Participation in the Institute was a valuable experience in the following areas (check all applicable):

   _____ clarifying problems
   _____ developing useful solutions to problems
   _____ providing information about available services for migrants
   _____ improving my understanding of the migrant situation in Pennsylvania
   _____ other:

4. What was the most valuable aspect of the Institute for you?

5. What was the least valuable aspect of the Institute for you.

6. How successful was the Institute in achieving its goals?
   a) to provide an opportunity for information exchange and discussion. Achieved: yes ____ some ____ no ____

   b) to focus on practical problems faced by agencies and organizations in dealing with migrant families. Achieved: yes ____ some ____ no ____

   c) to suggest various alternative solutions to the problems faced by agencies and organizations in developing more effective and individualized ties to the people and communities they serve. Achieved: yes ____ some ____ no ____.

7. If the Institute could be done over, how would you improve it? (different dates or times, format, leaders, participants, ...)

COMMENTS:

p. 46 blank

47

MIGRANT INSTITUTE EVALUATION

DIRECTIONS: For each statement made below, please check the extent of your agreement or disagreement with it. Add any comments as you wish.

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. This morning's speaker displayed a great deal of knowledge and expertise in his/her field. COMMENTS (strengths, weaknesses...):				
2. This morning's presentations gave me much information which will be directly useful to me in my work with migrant farmworkers. COMMENTS (strengths, weaknesses...):				
3. This morning's main presentation was too theoretical and the information presented does not have much practical application to my work with migrant farmworkers. COMMENTS (strengths, weaknesses...):				
4. This morning's panel discussion was useful in clarifying and expanding upon the information presented by the speaker. COMMENTS (strengths, weaknesses...):				

5. Please add any other comments about the Institute (organization, dissemination, registration ...)

Name_____ (optional) Affiliation_____ (optional)